



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

PHILOSOPHIE DER WERTE. Grundzüge einer Weltanschauung.  
 Von Hugo Münsterberg. Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1908. Pp.  
 viii, 481.

The kind of "value" with which Professor Münsterberg is concerned in this book is something which he calls "unconditional," "absolute" or "universally valid" value. And the following seem to be some of the chief things which he wishes to say about it.

He assumes, apparently, that nothing can have any "value" at all, either "conditional" or "unconditional," except what "satisfies" (or the satisfaction of?) some volition. But it is, he thinks, certain that we do not find *unconditional* value wherever *any* volition is satisfied. On the contrary, he thinks that there are two kinds of volition—a kind which he calls "personal" (and sometimes "selfish"), and a kind which he calls "pure" or "superpersonal;" and what *merely* satisfies a "personal" volition, or any number of personal volitions, is, he thinks, *never* unconditionally valuable. We have an "unconditional value" *only* where a superpersonal volition is satisfied; but here, he thinks, we have it *always*. That is to say, we have an "unconditional value" wherever, and only where, a superpersonal volition is satisfied.

But which of our volitions are "superpersonal"? Professor Münsterberg thinks he can point out one which is. We will, he thinks (he seems to think we *all* do), "that there should be a world"—an "independent," "self-subsistent" world. And this volition, he holds, is certainly "superpersonal." Here then is one superpersonal volition. And this one, he seems to hold, is not *merely* one among others. *All* superpersonal volitions seem to be somehow included in it; every volition which is superpersonal at all is a volition "that there should be a world." At all events their relation to it is such that none of them can be satisfied, except where this one is satisfied. We have, therefore (he seems to think), an unconditional value wherever and only where the volition "that there should be a world" is satisfied.

But this volition may, he holds, be satisfied in a good many different ways. To will that there should be a world is, he seems

to hold, the same thing as to will that our experiences (*Erlebnisse*) should not be *merely* experiences; and this again is the same thing as to will that each should "recur in a new experience" or that there should be a "relation of identity" between it and another experience. And wherever a volition that one experience should "recur identically" in another is satisfied, there, he seems to hold, our volition that "there should be a world" is satisfied and we have an unconditional value. We have, therefore, an "unconditional value" wherever, and only where, a volition that one experience should "recur identically" in another is satisfied.

And he often seems to speak as if such a volition were satisfied wherever one experience *actually does* recur identically in another; and as if, therefore, whenever one experience actually does recur identically in another, this fact itself were unconditionally valuable. But this, I think, is not really his view. He means to hold, I think, that our superpersonal volition is satisfied, and an unconditional value realized, only where we are *conscious* in some way of the identical recurrence of an experience. An identical recurrence of which no one were conscious would, I think he would say, certainly not satisfy our superpersonal volition nor be unconditionally valuable. But, whenever we are *conscious* of such an identical recurrence, there, I think, he does hold that our superpersonal volition really is satisfied and we have an unconditional value. We have an unconditional value then, it would seem, wherever, and only where, we are conscious that one experience recurs identically in another.

Professor Münsterberg seems then to hold the two principles that unconditional value is to be found wherever and only where a superpersonal volition is satisfied; and that this again occurs wherever and only where we find one experience recurring identically in another. And he next proceeds to classify the cases in which, as he thinks, we do find such an identical recurrence. He distinguishes twenty-four such cases and devotes a section of his book to each. These twenty-four cases, he seems to think, are the only cases in which we do find an identical recurrence of the kind he means and are therefore the only unconditional values.

These twenty-four unconditional values he divides into four main groups, each of which contains six different values.

The first group consists of six values which he calls "logical" values; and these six cases, he seems to think, exhaust all the cases in which "knowledge" is unconditionally valuable—indeed, he seems to think that they exhaust all the cases in which we have anything which can properly be called knowledge at all. These six kinds of valuable knowledge are, it appears, the knowledge of the existence (*Dasein*) or independent existence of "things;" the knowledge of the independent existence of other persons; the knowledge of the independent "validity" of some of our own volitions (*i. e.*, apparently, that they are superpersonal); the natural sciences: history: and finally "Reason"—under which title Professor Münsterberg seems to include, among other things, logic and mathematics. Professor Münsterberg seems to think that all knowledge of any of these six kinds is unconditionally valuable. Each kind must, therefore, according to him, consist in some sort of consciousness that one experience recurs identically in another; and it should be noted that the "identical recurrence," which he thinks he finds in each of these six cases, is in each case of a different kind. Thus the independent existence of a *thing* is, he thinks, constituted by the fact that the content of a particular kind of experience is *capable* of being experienced "by every conceivable subject;" here, therefore, "identical recurrence" means merely the *possibility* of recurring identically in the experience of every conceivable person. But the independent existence of a *person* is, he says, not constituted by this kind of identical recurrence. To say that a person "exists independently" is (it seems) to say that his will is *capable* of "taking up an attitude" (*Stellungnehmen*) to "every conceivable object," and here, therefore, though the identical recurrence again consists in a mere possibility, it is a possibility of recurring in quite a different way. Thus it appears that, according to Professor Münsterberg, when we know that certain kinds of contents are capable of being experienced by anyone whatever, this knowledge is equivalent to knowing that they exist independently and *is* unconditionally valuable; but if we were to know that a will was capable of being experienced by anyone whatever, this would *not* be equivalent to knowing that it existed independently and the knowledge would have *no* unconditional value. And similarly in each of the other four kinds of valuable knowledge, the kind of identical recurrence, in the knowledge

of which (according to Professor Münsterberg) the value consists, seems in each case again to be specifically different. It is not necessary, I think, to give Professor Münsterberg's definitions of them all. But it should be noted that in the case of the natural sciences and history, the kind of identical recurrence which he declares to be essential to their value is such that only a small part of the knowledge in which those sciences actually consist, can, according to him, be unconditionally valuable. The discoveries of any of the natural sciences are, he seems to think, unconditionally valuable only where they consist in finding out that the *parts* of which a thing is composed persist unchanged even when the thing itself is destroyed. And in the case of history, he insists that unconditional value is to be found in it only where it discovers a certain kind of "connection" (*Zusammenhang*) between the wills of different persons. What kind of connection he means he never, I think, clearly explains; but it is plain that he means to exclude a great number of the connections which history actually does discover, since he insists that the connections he means are in no case *causal* connections. He holds, indeed, the extravagant view that a volition never is causally connected either with any other volition or with anything else, and he gives as a reason for this the assertion that no volition ever occurs at any time at all—that all are timeless; whence he infers that none can be causally connected with anything since causal connection involves succession in time.

His second group of unconditional values consists of six, which he calls "æsthetic values." These six, he says, are: A certain sort of "harmony" among *things*—found wherever we find beauty in Nature; Love (in a wide sense); Happiness (in the only sense in which Happiness is unconditionally valuable); and three forms of Fine Art, namely: Drawing, Painting and Sculpture (*bildende Kunst*); Literature; and Music. Each of these is, he says, constituted by a certain kind of identical recurrence among the elements of some manifold; and, whereas in the case of the six valuable kinds of knowledge the kind of identical recurrence meant seemed in each case (as I said) to be specifically different; in the case of these six logical values it seems to be exactly the same. In each case, Professor Münsterberg thinks, it consists in an identity of *will*; that is to say, each element of the manifold must be willing the same result. This

view, of course, involves the paradoxical assertion that mere things and colors and lines and words and musical notes, all of them really have volitions; since Professor Münsterberg does not deny that manifolds composed of such elements may have æsthetic value. And he does not shrink from asserting this paradox. He thinks, apparently, that he can soften it sufficiently by explaining that, though these things, in a sense, "really" (*wirklich*) do will, their volitions are not "real" in one of the senses in which we most commonly (he thinks) use the word; that is to say, they are not real in the sense of "existing independently," since (as he explained in the case of the second "logical" value) the existence of a will consists in its capability of taking up a volitional attitude to every conceivable object, and mere things, he thinks, can only take up a volitional attitude toward a single object.

So far I have imitated Professor Münsterberg in speaking as if he held that the mere union of the elements of a manifold by identity of volition were *itself* "unconditionally valuable." He constantly does, in fact, so speak, as if love itself or a work of art itself were the æsthetic values of which he is speaking. But this, I think, is not really his view. Here, as always, what he really considers to be unconditionally valuable is not, I think, the mere fact of identical recurrence, but only some sort of consciousness of it. And in the case of the æsthetic values he holds, I think, that a different kind of consciousness is necessary from that which was sufficient in the case of the logical values. We must, he seems to hold, apprehend the identical volition of the elements of a manifold with a peculiar sort of sympathy on the part of our own wills if we are to have an "æsthetic" value.

His third main group of "unconditional values" consists of six which he calls "ethical values." And these six are, he says: Growth (the growth of animals and plants), Progress (in human society), Self-development, Economic Activity (*Wirtschaft*), Law and Morality. In these six cases he speaks more constantly than ever, as if the things *themselves* and not merely the consciousness of them were unconditionally valuable; but even here, I think, he does not really mean it.

As for the kind of "identical recurrence" which is essential to these six values, he holds, I think, that it consists in each case in the fact that some entity actually does be-

come that which it willed to become. Thus "growth," for instance, occurs where a flower wills to become a fruit and actually does become one; and the value of which he is speaking is constituted, he insists, not by the *result*, *e. g.* the existence of the fruit (though that may have unconditional value of another kind), but by the "transition" (*Uebergang*) from the will of the flower to its realization. It seems, however, to be doubtful, in some of these six cases, whether, in his view, we have the kind of unconditional value in question, *wherever* an entity becomes what it willed to become, *no matter what it willed*. He sometimes seems to speak as if he held that we do; but often again he seems to contradict this view and to insist that we have this kind of value *only* where what was willed was of a certain kind. For instance, he seems sometimes to hold that we have the value called "Growth" *only* where some natural object has willed to become serviceable to man and has become so; but sometimes to hold that we have it *whenever* it becomes what it willed to become, and he does not explain whether he holds that whenever it becomes what it willed to become it has also willed to become serviceable to man and has become so. Similarly in the case of human progress he seems sometimes to hold that it occurs, and is unconditionally valuable, wherever the will of a society that its members should will what it wills is realized; and sometimes to hold that it occurs *only* where the wills of the society's members are thus brought nearer to being "superpersonal" volitions, and in this case he definitely points out that the two views are inconsistent with one another, *i. e.* that where the wills of the members have been willed to become and have become in harmony with that of the society, it is by no means always the case that they are, therefore, nearer to being superpersonal volitions. Which of these two inconsistent views he wishes us to adopt I do not know.

The fourth and last main group of values consists of six, which he calls "metaphysical" values. And these, it would seem, consist in certain religious and philosophical "convictions" (*Ueberzeugungen*). These convictions must, according to Professor Münsterberg's principles, be again "convictions" of the "identical recurrence" of one experience in another; and one point in which they differ from the three kinds of value hitherto considered, seems to lie in the fact that they are found only where a value of one of these three former kinds is believed to

recur identically in a value of one of the other two kinds. That is to say, we have a "metaphysical value" *only* where we are convinced that a "logical value" recurs identically in an "ethical" or "æsthetic" value; or an ethical in a logical or æsthetic one; or an æsthetic in a logical or ethical value. That we have metaphysical values *only* in such cases is, I think, plainly Professor Münsterberg's view. But whether we have them in *all* such cases is, I think, much more obscure. He seems sometimes to speak as if we had a metaphysical value only where *certain* kinds of logical value are united with *certain* kinds of æsthetic or ethical. Sometimes again, as if we had one only where *certain* kinds of logical value are united *both* with certain kinds of æsthetic *and* with certain kinds of ethical. Sometimes again as if there were only one metaphysical value, namely, the conviction that *all* values of all three kinds are united and recur identically in one another. And what he means by the identical recurrence of one kind of value in another is again very obscure. Sometimes he seems to mean that one kind of value recurs in another only where *everything* which has the one kind also has the other. Sometimes that the recurrence occurs, provided only that everything which has the one kind will ultimately have the other. Sometimes that it occurs, provided only that *some* things which have the one kind also have the other. Sometimes again that all may be said to recur in one another, provided only that all are creations of a single "fundamental will" or "super-ego." I gather, however, that he does believe that there is a God who insures the final triumph of "the good," and also that all values are creations of a single "fundamental will" or "super-ego," "in which" (and also "which") we all of us are.

Such seem to be some of the main propositions which Professor Münsterberg seems anxious to recommend.

It would be strange if, in so large a book, he said nothing whatever which was true or which could possibly be useful to anybody. And I suppose some of the things he says are true and may possibly be useful to somebody. But the number of such things seems to me to be exceedingly small. The greater part of his propositions are, so far as I can see, purely arbitrary fictions, which there is nothing to recommend either in the book or out of it except the fact that he himself has apparently come somehow, in some fashion, to believe them. How he himself



has come to believe them true he does not explain, and still less how anybody else is to satisfy himself that they are so. Take first the proposition that we have "unconditional value" where and only where a "superpersonal volition" is satisfied. Does Professor Münsterberg think that this, as it stands, is a purely self-evident proposition? Or has he arrived at it by reviewing all the actual cases where he thinks he finds unconditional value and thinking he perceives in each that a "superpersonal volition" is satisfied? For my part, it does not seem to me to be self-evident, and when I review the cases in which I think I find unconditional value and in which Professor Münsterberg thinks he finds it, I find many in which, so far as I can see, no sort of volition is satisfied. Professor Münsterberg seems to suppose that we cannot believe anything to "exist independently" without having previously willed, in general, that things should exist independently; but such a volition, so far as I can see, is of comparatively rare occurrence, and where it does occur, does not generally occur till long after we have already attained beliefs in the independent existence of things. So, too, he seems to suppose that we can never find anything beautiful without having previously desired beauty in general; but, so far as I can see, the experience of beauty may, on the contrary, often precede the desire for it. It may, perhaps, be true in the case of every unconditional value which ever occurs that somebody, either before or after, has had a desire that that *sort of thing* should occur, and hence that every unconditional value "satisfies some volition," in the sense that it is the *sort of thing* that somebody at some time has wished for; but I think Professor Münsterberg means much more than this. He seems to me to be gratuitously supposing that volitions exist in cases where observation does not give the smallest reason to suppose that they do exist. And even if we confine ourselves to cases where unconditional values do satisfy some volition, what reason is there for supposing that this volition is a "superpersonal" one? Professor Münsterberg certainly means, by this supposition, that all volitions which are satisfied by an unconditional value have some other property which distinguishes them from all other volitions, *over and above* the mere fact that what satisfies the one class is unconditionally valuable and what satisfies the other is not. But so far as I can see, a volition which is satisfied by an unconditional value may be *in all other respects* precisely

similar to one which is satisfied by what has no unconditional value. It seems never to have occurred to Professor Münsterberg that this is a possible view. He seems simply to assume that all volitions which are satisfied by unconditional values must have some other property *besides*, which belongs to all of them and to no volition except them.

Take again the proposition that we have an unconditional value wherever and only where we find an "identical recurrence." Does Professor Münsterberg claim that this is self-evident or has he arrived at this also by a review of all the cases where he thinks he finds unconditional value?

If we were to use the phrase "identical recurrence" in such a wide sense as to include every case which anybody would call a case of "identity in difference," then, I think, it may possibly be true that we have unconditional value *only where* we have an "identical recurrence." But if we give the phrase such a wide meaning as this, it seems plainly absurd to hold the converse proposition, namely, that we have unconditional value, *wherever* we find an identical recurrence; since an immense number of apprehensions, which seem to have no unconditional value, would in this sense be apprehensions of identical recurrence. But it may be doubtful whether Professor Münsterberg means to use the phrase in such a wide sense as this. The only clue he gives us to his meaning is by apparently holding that it is a relation which occurs in all the twenty-four cases he distinguishes *and* in no others. This is certainly not true of "identity in difference" in the widest sense, since that occurs in many cases which he does not include in his twenty-four; and it is, I think, also plainly true of no relation whatever, since there is no relation at all which is exhibited at the same time in all his twenty-four cases and *only* in them. The truth is, I think, that he does not use the phrase in any one fixed sense, but means by it different things at different times. And the only definite proposition which he is fairly constantly anxious to maintain is not that we have unconditional value wherever and only where we find an identical recurrence in any one fixed sense, but that we have it wherever and only where we find one or other of the twenty-four cases which he distinguishes. And both sides of *this* proposition seem to me to be plainly false: *both* that we have it *only* where we have one of his twenty-four cases, *and* that we have it *wherever* we find one of these.

Take, for instance, his six logical values. He holds, apparently, that whenever we know that a certain kind of content is *capable* of recurring in any conceivable experience, this knowledge has unconditional value. But, granted that such a piece of knowledge has unconditional value *sometimes*, how can one suppose that it has it *always*? And then, on the other hand, he seems to hold that the knowledge of causal relations never has unconditional value. What could be more arbitrary than the distinction between the two cases? This kind of knowledge also, it seems plain, is in fact a kind of knowledge which sometimes, but not always, has unconditional value. Or take his æsthetic values. Here, perhaps, it may be the case that we have an æsthetic value *wherever* we feel a harmony between two different wills, though this is by no means plain. But what reason is there for saying that we have æsthetic value *only where* we feel such a harmony? Professor Münsterberg can, as we saw, maintain this result only by maintaining that colors and lines and musical notes all have volitions, and this seems to be a purely fantastic hypothesis which there is nothing in observation to support.

These two propositions, that we have unconditional value where and only where a "superpersonal volition" is satisfied, and where and only where we find an "identical recurrence," are, I think, characteristic specimens of the kind of proposition of which this book is full.

London.

G. E. MOORE.

NATIONAL AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By Frederic Harrison.

REALITIES AND IDEALS. By Frederic Harrison. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1908.

These volumes are the third and fourth of a series of essays collected and published by Mr. Frederic Harrison in the year 1907-1908. The essays have been collected from various sources. Most of them have appeared in reviews, English or American, or have been delivered as lectures, to the London Positivist Society, or on other public occasions. Mr. Harrison calls the collection a biographical series. The dates of their original composition cover a period of over forty years. They all represent a point of view that has altered little (or nothing) during all that time: the point of view of a Comtist who seeks to apply the prin-